

## Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. No claims have been amended. Claims 1-3 and 7-18 have been canceled. Claims 19-37 have been added. Therefore, claims 19-37 are now presented for examination.

In a Final Office Action dated June 28, 2001, claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11-13, 15, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,905,910 of Anderson ("Anderson") and US Patent No. 5,619,723 of Jones et al. ("Jones"). The rejection has been obviated by the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11-13, 15, 16 and 18. Nevertheless, applicant submits that new claims 19-37 are patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones.

Anderson discloses a system for the simultaneous operation of multiple disk drives in a computer. The system includes a first disk drive having an interrupt generating circuit to generate a first interrupt signal. The first disk drive receives a first disk transfer command from the computer, processes the first disk transfer command, and generates the first interrupt signal upon completion of the first disk data transfer command. The system also includes a second disk drive, also having an interrupt generating circuit to generate a second interrupt signal. The second disk drive receives a second disk transfer command from the computer while the first disk drive is processing the first disk transfer command such that both the first and second disk drives are simultaneously active. The second disk drive processes the second disk transfer command and generates the second interrupt signal upon completion of the second disk data transfer command. See Anderson at col. 1 ll. 49-65.

Nevertheless, Anderson does not disclose or suggest an interface coupled to a system bus that communicates directly with BIOS. In fact, the Office Action admits that Anderson fails to teach an interface that is connected to a system bus and communicates with BIOS. See Final Office Action at Page 3. However, the Office Action asserts that

Jones discloses an interface connected to a system bus and that communicates with BIOS (Page 4).

Jones discloses a disk drive array controller. The controller includes a microcontroller CPU with embedded ROM and RAM, a bus interface, and five connected disk drives. The ROM contains the firmware for controller. A system bus coupled to the bus interface provides a communication link between the controller and a host computer, which uses the array of disk drives as secondary memory. See Jones at col. 14, ll. 18-27. However, Jones does not disclose or suggest the bus interface communicating with BIOS. Although, the controller includes a ROM that stores the controller firmware, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the ROM including BIOS.

Claim 19 recites an interface coupled to a system bus that communicates directly with a Basic Input Output System (BIOS). As described above, neither Anderson nor Jones disclose or suggest a bus interface that communicates directly with BIOS. Consequently, any combination of Anderson and Jones would also not disclose or suggest a bus interface that communicates directly with BIOS. Therefore, claim 19 is patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones.

Claims 20-24 depend from claim 19 and include additional limitations. As a result, claims 20-24 are also patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones.

Claim 25 recites receiving an IDE request from a Basic Input Output System (BIOS) at an IDE interface, the IDE interface communicating directly with the BIOS. Therefore, for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 19, claim 25 is also patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones. Since claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 25 and include additional limitations, claims 26 and 27 are also patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones.

Claim 28 recites an interface coupled to a system bus that communicates directly with a Basic Input Output System (BIOS). Accordingly, for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 19, claim 28 is also patentable over the combination of Anderson

and Jones. Because claims 29-34 depend from claim 28 and include additional limitations, claims 29-34 are also patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones.

Claim 35 recites an IDE interface coupled to the system bus that communicates directly with the BIOS. Thus, for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 19, claim 35 is also patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones. Since claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 35 and include additional limitations, claims 36 and 37 are also patentable over the combination of Anderson and Jones.

Also in the Final Office Action, claims 3, 10, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Jones in further view of Jenkins (U.S. Patent No. 4,047,157). The rejection is obviated by the cancellation of claims 3, 10, and 14. However, applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Anderson and Jones even in view of Jenkins.

Jenkins discloses a controller for use in a data processing system. Nonetheless Jenkins does not disclose or suggest a bus interface communicating with BIOS. As described above, neither Anderson nor Jones disclose or suggest a bus interface that communicates directly with BIOS. Accordingly, any combination of Anderson, Jones and Jenkins would not disclose or suggest a bus interface that communicates with BIOS. Therefore, the present claims are patentable over the combination of Anderson, Jones and Jenkins.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Jones and in further view of Solomon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,165). The rejection of claim 17 is obviated by the cancellation of the claim. However, applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Anderson and Jones even in view of Solomon.

The Office Action asserts that Solomon discloses a first FIFO memory driven by an exclusive-or gate to access a storage device. Even if so, Solomon does not disclose or

Docket No. 042390.P3373  
Application No. 09/164,898

suggest a bus interface communicating with BIOS. As described above, neither Anderson nor Jones disclose or suggest a bus interface that communicates directly with BIOS. Accordingly, any combination of Anderson, Jones and Solomon would not disclose or suggest a bus interface that communicates with BIOS. Therefore, the present claims are patentable over the combination of Anderson, Jones and Solomon.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10/3/01



---

Mark L. Watson  
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(303) 740-1980

**Marked Version to Show Changes Made**  
Additions are underlined, deletions are bracketed.

1-3. (Cancelled)

7-18. (Cancelled)

19-37. (New)

DEPOSIT OF CORRESPONDENCE  
(37 C.F.R. § 1.8 (c))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with  
sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Assistant  
Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20531.

On October 3, 2001  
Date of Deposit

April Worley  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

April Worley 10/3/01  
Signature Date